# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,	)
Plaintiff,	
v.	) Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-JOE-SAJ
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,	
Defendants.	)

# STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO TYSON POULTRY, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS COUNT 3 OF THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

COMES NOW Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma, ex rel. W.A. Drew Edmondson in his capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Secretary of the Environment C. Miles Tolbert in his capacity as the Trustee for Natural Resources for the State of Oklahoma under CERCLA ("the State"), by and through counsel, and respectfully submits the following reply brief in further support of its Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Brief in Opposition to Defendant Tyson Poultry, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Count 3 of the First Amended Complaint and to reply to new matters raised by Defendant Tyson Poultry, Inc. ("Tyson Poultry") in its responsive papers. Specifically, the State states as follows:

- 1. Contrary to Defendant Tyson Poultry's assertions, there is no right to have the last word with respect to a motion.
- 2. Contrary to Defendant Tyson Poultry's assertions, the State's proposed supplemental brief is proper and not merely a rehash of previous arguments. Rather, the proposed supplemental brief is made necessary by the repeated incorrect characterizations of

both the law and the State's allegations by Defendant Tyson Poultry <u>in its reply brief</u>. The supplemental brief, for instance, sets the record straight, without limitation, as to the following:

- a. Defendant Tyson Poultry's incorrect contention in its reply brief that Hallstrom v. Tillamook County, 110 S.Ct. 304 (1989), addressed the issue of compliance with the regulatory notice requirements under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), when in reality Hallstrom pertained solely to the issue of compliance with the statutory notice requirements under RCRA;
- b. Defendant Tyson Poultry's incorrect contention in its reply brief that the notice provisions in the Clean Water Act ("CWA") and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA") are analogous to the notice provisions in RCRA, when in reality RCRA, unlike the CWA and CERCLA, contains no statutory mandate requiring compliance with the regulatory notice provisions;
- c. Defendant Tyson Poultry's reliance in its reply brief, on *Darbouze v*.

  Chevron Corp., 1998 WL 42278 (Jan. 8, 1998 E.D. Pa.), an unreported decision whose reasoning is wholly flawed in that it fails to appreciate that RCRA was amended in 1984;
- d. Defendant Tyson Poultry's incorrect contention in its reply brief that the State may not bring a RCRA citizen suit claim ignores clear Supreme Court language to the contrary, and Defendant Tyson Poultry's reliance upon *United States v. City of Hopewell*, 508 F.Supp. 526 (E.D. Va. 1980), a CWA case, suffers the same legal flaws as *California v. Department of the Navy, 631 F.Supp. 584 (N.D. Cal. 1986)*, the case upon which it relied in its initial brief.

Accordingly, the State submits that its proposed supplemental brief will indeed assist the Court in understanding and resolving the issues before it. The stridency with which Defendant

Tyson Poultry opposes the State's Motion for Leave simply underscores this fact. Defendant Tyson Poultry would plainly like the incorrect contentions of its reply brief to stand uncorrected. That, however, would not serve the interests of justice.

- Contrary to Defendant Tyson Foods' assertion, the State's Motion for Leave 3. accurately recited that Defendant Tyson Poultry objected to the filing of a supplemental brief by the State. The State was under no obligation to recite a counter-proposal advanced by Defendant Tyson Poultry that the State had rejected, and that merely reflected Defendant Tyson Poultry's unfounded belief that it was entitled to the last word. Further, Defendant Tyson Poultry's request to file its own supplemental brief, unlike the request of the State, is unsupported by any articulated need, other than to in fact have the last word. Consequently, since Defendant Tyson Poultry does not articulate any need for a response, the Court should conclude the State's supplemental brief creates no need for further clarification by Defendant Tyson Poultry.
- Allowing the State's supplemental brief to be filed is within the Court's 4. discretion. See LCivR 7.1(h). The fundamental issue presented is whether the supplemental brief assists the Court in understanding and resolving the issues before it. The State respectfully submits that its supplemental brief will assist the Court and should be permitted to be filed and considered.

WHEREFORE, this Court should grant the State's Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Brief in Opposition to Tyson Poultry, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Count 3 of the First Amended Complaint.

W.A. Drew Edmondson (OBA #2628) Attorney General Kelly H. Burch (OBA #17067) J. Trevor Hammons (OBA #20234) Assistant Attorney General State of Oklahoma 2300 North Lincoln Boulevard Suite 112 Oklahoma City, OK 73105

M. David Riggs (OBA #7688)

Joseph P. Lennart (OBA #5371)

Richard T. Garren (OBA #3253)

Douglas A. Wilson (OBA #13128)

Sharon K. Weaver (OBA #19010)

Riggs, Abney, Neal, Turpen,

Orbison & Lewis

502 West Sixth Street

Tulsa, OK 74119

(918) 587-3161

(405) 521-3921

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

January 10, 2006.

Page 5 of 7

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on January 10, 2006, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing. Based on the electronic records currently on file, the Clerk of Court will transmit a Notice of Electronic filing to the following ECF registrants:

#### Frederick C Baker

fbaker@motleyrice.com mcarr@motleyrice.com;fhmorgan@motleyrice.com

#### Vicki Bronson

vbronson@cwlaw.com lphillips@cwlaw.com

#### • Martin Allen Brown

mbrown@jpm-law.com brownmartinesq@yahoo.com

### • Paula M Buchwald

pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com loelke@ryanwhaley.com

### • Louis Werner Bullock

LBULLOCK@MKBLAW.NET

NHODGE@MKBLAW.NET;BDEJONG@MKBLAW.NET

## • W A Drew Edmondson

fc\_docket@oag.state.ok.us

drew edmondson@oag.state.ok.us;suzy thrash@oag.state.ok.us.

#### • Delmar R Ehrich

dehrich@faegre.com kcarney@faegre.com

#### John R Elrod

jelrod@cwlaw.com vmorgan@cwlaw.com

## • Bruce Wayne Freeman

bfreeman@cwlaw.com sperry@cwlaw.com

# • Richard T Garren

rgarren@riggsabney.com dellis@riggsabney.com

# • Dorothy Sharon Gentry

sgentry@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com

#### • Robert W George

robert.george@kutakrock.com donna.sinclair@kutakrock.com

#### • James Martin Graves

igraves@bassettlawfirm.com

### • Thomas James Grever

tgrever@lathropgage.com

### • Jennifer Stockton Griffin

jgriffin@lathropgage.com

# • John Trevor Hammons

thammons@oag.state.ok.us

Trevor Hammons@oag.state.ok.us;Jean Burnett@oag.state.ok.us

#### • Theresa Noble Hill

thillcourts@rhodesokla.com mnave@rhodesokla.com

Phixon@jpm-law.com

Mark D Hopson

mhopson@sidley.com dwetmore@sidley.com;joraker@sidley.com

• Kelly S Hunter Burch

fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us kelly\_burch@oag.state.ok.us;jean\_burnett@oag.state.ok.us

• Stephen L Jantzen

sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com loelke@ryanwhaley.com;mkeplinger@ryanwhaley.com

• John F Jeske

jjeske@faegre.com qsperrazza@faegre.com;dboehme@faegre.com

• Jay Thomas Jorgensen

jjorgensen@sidley.com noman@sidley.com;bmatsui@sidley.com

• Raymond Thomas Lay

rtl@kiralaw.com dianna@kiralaw.com;niccilay@cox.net

• Nicole Marie Longwell

Nlongwell@jpm-law.com ahubler@jpm-law.com

• Archer Scott McDaniel

Smcdaniel@jpm-law.com jwaller@jpm-law.com

• James Randall Miller

rmiller@mkblaw.net smilata@mkblaw.net;clagrone@mkblaw.net

• Robert Allen Nance

mance@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com

• George W Owens

gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com

• David Phillip Page

dpage@mkblaw.net smilata@mkblaw.net

• Robert Paul Redemann

rredemann@pmrlaw.net cataylor@pmrlaw.net;shopper@pmrlaw.net

• Melvin David Riggs

driggs@riggsabney.com pmurta@riggsabney.com

• Randall Eugene Rose

rer@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com

• Patrick Michael Ryan

pryan@ryanwhaley.com jmickle@ryanwhaley.com;kshocks@ryanwhaley.com

• Robert E Sanders

rsanders@youngwilliams.com

• David Charles Senger

dsenger@pmrlaw.net lthorne@pmrlaw.net;shopper@pmrlaw.net

· Colin Hampton Tucker

chtucker@rhodesokla.com scottom@rhodesokla.com

• John H Tucker

ituckercourts@rhodesokla.com

• Elizabeth C Ward

lward@motleyrice.com

- Sharon K Weaver
  - sweaver@riggsabney.com ajohnson@riggsabney.com
- Timothy K Webster
  - twebster@sidley.com jwedeking@sidley.com;ahorner@sidley.com
- Gary V Weeks
- Terry Wayen West

terry@thewestlawfirm.com

- Edwin Stephen Williams
  - steve.williams@youngwilliams.com
- Douglas Allen Wilson

Doug Wilson@riggsabney.com pmurta@riggsabney.com

• Lawrence W Zeringue

lzeringue@pmrlaw.net cataylor@pmrlaw.net;shopper@pmrlaw.net

I hereby certify that on January 10, 2006, I served the foregoing document by U.S. Postal Service on the following, who are not registered participants of the ECF System:

#### Thomas C Green

Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP 1501 K ST NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005

#### William H Narwold

Motley Rice LLC (Hartford) 20 CHURCH ST 17TH FLR HARTFORD, CT 06103

#### C Miles Tolbert

Secretary of the Environment State of Oklahoma 3800 NORTH CLASSEN OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73118

211. Mad Reg